

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-13209

ERIK EDOFF, *et al.*,

Sean F. Cox

United States District Court Judge

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING**  
**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF NO. 37)**

Acting *pro se*, an unidentified individual referring to herself as “Jane Doe” filed this civil action on December 3, 2024, asserting claims against more than forty named Defendants.

The matter recently came before this Court on: 1) Plaintiff’s “Motion to proceed as Jane Doe” (ECF No. 3); and 2) a “Motion for More Definite Statement And To Prohibit Proceeding As ‘Jane Doe’” (ECF No. 10), filed by a group of the named Defendants. In an Opinion and Order issued on March 6, 2025, this Court denied Plaintiff’s Motion to proceed as Jane Doe, ordering as follows:

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed As Jane Doe is **DENIED** and the Court **ORDERS** that Plaintiff may only proceed in this case under her own full name. **No later than March 31, 2025**, Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint in this case that identifies Plaintiff’s own full name in its caption and in the body of it.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if Plaintiff fails to file an Amended Complaint identifying her own full name by March 31, 2025, the Court will dismiss this action without prejudice.**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion for More Definite Statement is **DENIED**. Nevertheless, the Court **ORDERS** that Plaintiff may amend the allegations in any Amended Complaint that Plaintiff files by March 31, 2025, in order to attempt to cure any pleading deficiencies.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants’ request for the Court to dismiss this action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) is **DENIED WITHOUT**

**PREJUDICE.** If they wish to do so, the L'Anse Creuse Defendants may file such a motion after Plaintiff files her Amended Complaint.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, no later than April 4, 2025,** Plaintiff shall complete and present to the Clerk's Office the following documents to effect service in this case: 1) One (1) copy of the Complaint for each Defendant; 2) Two (2) USM 285 forms for each Defendant; and 3) Three (3) summonses for each Defendant.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall forward those materials to the U.S. Marshals Service, which is authorized to mail requests for waiver of service to all Defendants, in the manner set forth by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d)(2). If waiver of service is unsuccessful, the U.S. Marshal is directed to serve a copy of the Complaint, summons and this Order upon each Defendant named in the Complaint without prepayment of the usual costs for such service.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

(ECF No. 35 at PageID.235-237).

On or about March 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed a *pro se* "Motion in Response to Amend Complaint / Response to the defendants [sic] motions #3, #9, #10 and the court's initial response." (ECF No. 37).

The Court construes this *pro se* submission as a motion seeking reconsideration of this Court's denial of Plaintiff's Motion To Proceed As Jane Doe.

Local Rule 7.1(h) of the Local Rules for the Eastern District of Michigan governs motions for rehearing or reconsideration and provides that "[n]o response to the motion and no oral argument are permitted unless the court orders otherwise." Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). The Court concludes that neither a response from Defendants, nor oral argument, are necessary as to this motion.

In order to obtain relief on a motion for reconsideration, the movant must show that "the court made a mistake, correcting the mistake changes the outcome of the prior decision, and the mistake was based on the record and law before the court at the time of its prior decision," an "intervening change in controlling law warrants a different outcome," or "[n]ew facts warrant a

different outcome and the new facts could not have been discovered with reasonable diligence before the prior decision.” E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(2).

Having reviewed Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration, this Court continues to believe that denying Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed As Jane Doe is appropriate and warranted under the applicable law and the record in this case.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED WITH PREJUDICE** and that this Court’s March 6, 2025 Opinion and Order remains in full force and effect. Thus, among other things, no later than March 31, 2025, Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint in this case that identifies Plaintiff’s own full name in its caption and in the body of it. Otherwise, this action will be dismissed without prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 21, 2025

s/Sean F. Cox  
Sean F. Cox  
U. S. District Judge

I hereby certify that on March 21, 2025, the document above was served on counsel and/or the parties of record via electronic means and/or First Class Mail.

s/Emily Vradenburg  
Case Manager